



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the bounds named in the deed, but the general words used in the latter clause will be held to apply to timber ejusdem generis with that specifically named. *Darnell v. Wilmoth* (Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, Nov. 14, 1911), 12 S. E. 1023.

Pleading—Declaration—Ad Damnum Clause.—A declaration in an action, even though sounding in damages, is not demurrable because it does not state the amount of damages claimed in the form of an averment. It is sufficient if it appear in any part of the declaration. The ad damnum clause, while consistent with good form in pleading, is not indispensable. *Jenkins v. Montgomery* (Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, Nov. 21, 1911), 72 S. E. 1087.

The Hebert Case.—As our readers are doubtless aware, the cause celebre of *Hebert v. Hebert* came before Mr. Justice Charbonneau on appeal from Judge Laurendeau. The former holds that the *Ne temere* decree of the Roman Catholic Church has no civil effect whatever in relation to marriages, and has no control over the civil law of the province of Quebec; and that any minister, Protestant or otherwise, qualified to solemnize marriage between parties capable of entering into the bonds of matrimony, can legally and effectually perform the ceremony no matter what the religious faith of either of the parties may be. The formal judgment is as follows:

"Basing itself on the motives above given in detail, the court annuls the judgment of March 23, 1911, declares the marriage of the said Eugene Hebert and Dame E. Cloutre, celebrated on July 14, 1908, before the Rev. Wm. Timberlake, upon production of a license, dated July 3, 1908, good and valid; declares that the decree proclaimed by the Congregation of the Council of the Roman Catholic Church on August 2, 1907, beginning with these words, '*Ne Temere inirentur*,' has no civil effect on said marriage, that the decree of the Archbishop of the Diocese of Montreal, dated November 12, 1909, produced in this case by the plaintiff, has no judicial effect in said case, and rejects the opposition of the defendant opposant and of the tierce opposant es qualite as to the other conclusions therein taken, each party paying his own costs from the date of the two inscriptions of the defendant opposant, and of the tierce opposante es qualite respectively, dated December 5, 1911."

This conclusion meets generally with the approval of the profession as a legal proposition; while from the wider standpoint it commends itself to the intelligence and spirit of a free country; for, surely, it cannot be that any ecclesiastical body can at will bastardise children who are the fruit of a *de facto* marriage, solemnized between persons who innocently think themselves to have been made man and wife according to the law of the land. However, the whole question will soon be settled by the case submitted by the Crown to the Supreme Court of Canada.—*Canada Law Journal* (March).